

Jerusalem is the undivided, eternal capital of Israel, and U.S. law—the Jerusalem Embassy Act—recognizes that this should be U.S. policy. Palestinian threats to declare a state on land they do not have any territorial control over—particularly Jerusalem—at the very least amounts to a renunciation of the Oslo process, and could legitimately be interpreted by Israel as an act of war. The Administration has not effectively dampened the dangerous proclamations issued by the Palestinian Authority on statehood, and as May 4th rapidly approaches, if U.S. policy remains murky, hostilities could occur.

The most recent statements by Palestinian leaders have been confusing and somewhat contradictory. A number of reports indicate that plans for a unilateral declaration of statehood may be delayed—at least until after Israel holds elections on May 17th. However, some of the comments suggest that the Palestinians are still intent on declaring a state on May 4th. On January 24th, a senior Palestinian official told the Voice of Palestine that May 4th “is a day [which has] international legitimacy” and that “the Palestinian leadership can not postpone this date for even an hour in announcing an independent Palestinian state.” The day before, another senior official said that May 4th is “a historic and vital day,” suggesting that the Palestinians will indeed declare a state on this day.

The Clinton Administration has done little to discourage Palestinian aspirations of having a unilaterally declared state recognized by the United States. On several occasions over the past year, the Clinton administration has refused to express U.S. opposition to the unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state, and has left it as an open question as to whether the United States will recognize a unilaterally declared Palestinian state. As a case in point, during President Clinton’s visit to Gaza, in December, Chairman Arafat reaffirmed his intention of establishing a Palestinian state with its capital in Jerusalem. Unfortunately, the President might have only encouraged this course when he said: “[T]he Palestinian people and their elected representatives now have a chance to determine their own destiny on their own land.”

Recently, however, the President has issued more appropriate comments on the issue of statehood. In an interview for a London-based Saudi newspaper in mid-January, President Clinton said that: “[We] oppose the declaration of a state or any other unilateral action by any party outside the negotiation process in a manner that could pre-empt the negotiations.” He also said that, “We are making maximum efforts to strengthen negotiations on the final status (of the Palestinian territories) and believe that those who think they can adopt unilateral measures during the transitory period are opening up a path to catastrophe.”

President Clinton’s latest remarks on this issue are welcome but do not go far enough. A careful reading of his comments suggests that the United States may oppose a unilaterally declared Palestinian state, but has left open the possibility of recognition. It is critical for the President privately to inform Chairman Arafat and publicly tell the world that a unilateral declaration of statehood is a grievous violation of Oslo and will be firmly opposed, and never recognized by the United States.

I am encouraged that Congress is working in a bipartisan basis to head off this destabilizing threat to peace in the Middle East. It is essential that the United States speak loudly and clearly in advance of May 4th, to prevent a terrible miscalculation by Chairman Arafat.

PROTECTING ISRAEL

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. DeLAY. Mr. Speaker, I worked with Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SALMON and now over 60 co-sponsors to introduce a resolution calling on the President to clarify American policy with respect to a unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state. I did this because I feel the Administration’s policy regarding Israel and the Middle East process has been confusing and misleading not only for the American people, but for the international community at large, and especially for the parties to the peace process itself.

The United States has never endorsed the creation of a Palestinian state. After the signing of the Oslo accords, the U.S. made it clear that all questions of sovereignty and statehood were a matter for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. However, First Lady Hillary Clinton’s public statement last May that “it will be in the long-term interests of the Middle East for Palestine to be a state . . . and seen on the same footing as any other state” put U.S. policy on this issue in severe and grave doubt.

The First Lady’s remarks came almost exactly one year before the scheduled expiration date in May, 1999 for completing the final status talks between Israel and the Palestinians under the Oslo agreement. Any unilateral declaration of statehood will constitute a fundamental violation of the Oslo accords because they were agreed to only after Chairman Arafat made an irrevocable commitment that, in his words, “all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.” Since resolving the political status of the Palestinian people while protecting the security of Israel is one of the central issues of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, any effort to act unilaterally on the issue will have the effect of destabilizing the current security situation not only in Israel but in the entire region.

So it is of great concern that despite official denials by the United States State Department and numerous other officials in the administration, the First Lady’s remarks were interpreted by many around the world, including Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat, as “a very important and clear signal” regarding the Administration’s position on the issue of Palestinian statehood. Arafat subsequently threatened to unilaterally declare an independent Palestinian state in May of 1999—which is now just three months away.

Last July, subsequent to the First Lady’s remarks, the United Nations voted to elevate the Palestinian observer mission at the UN to the status of a full observer mission, a status just short of that accorded an independent state.

Then last fall, while speaking before the United Nations, Yasser Arafat called on world leaders to support an independent Palestinian state—though the U.S. State Department scrambled mightily to prevent him from also repeating his threat to declare such a state unilaterally.

Mr. Speaker, what has been missing from this debate over the last year has been a public—and unequivocal—statement from President Clinton himself that the United States will never recognize the unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state. No amount of denials, statements, or clarifications by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and other functionaries down at the State Department can dispel the confusion and uncertainty about U.S. policy occasioned by the First Lady’s remarks. Rightly or wrongly, the perception of many around the world and even in this country is that only President Clinton has the clout to override the influence of the First Lady within his Administration on this point.

For the President to pretend otherwise is to hide his head, and America’s, in the sand. The need for the President to personally act to clarify the U.S. position was brought home when Yasser Arafat stated last July that “[t]here is a transition period of five years and after five years we have the right to declare an independent Palestine state. We are asking for an accurate implementation, an honest implementation of what has been signed in the White House under the supervision of President Clinton.”

Even after the conclusion of the Wye River agreement and the call for new elections in Israel, Chairman Arafat, his cabinet, the Palestinian legislature, and other officials continue to threaten to unilaterally proclaim the establishment of a Palestinian state when the Oslo accords expire on May 4, 1999. On January 24th, senior Palestinian official Saeb Erekat told the Voice of Palestine that May 4th “is a day [which has] international legitimacy” and that “the Palestinian leadership can not postpone this date for even an hour in announcing an independent Palestinian state.” The day before the Palestinian Minister of Planning and International Cooperation, Nabil Shaath, said that May 4th is “a historic and vital day” suggesting that the Palestinians will indeed declare a state on this day.

We must remember that Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians demand the whole West Bank and has declared “that there can be no permanent peace as long as the problem of Jerusalem remains unresolved.” The Palestinian Cabinet, on Thursday, September 24, stated that “at the end of the interim period, it (the Palestinian government) shall declare the establishment of a Palestinian state on all Palestinian land occupied since 1967, with Jerusalem as the eternal capital of the Palestinian state.”

It is way past time for the President to declare that the United States will never recognize a unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state, and that Israel, and Israel alone, can determine its security needs. This was made clear back in June, less than a month after the First Lady’s remarks, when Palestinian National Council Speaker Salim al-Za’nun announced that, “If following our declaration of state, Israel renews its occupation of

East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and the Gaza strip, the Palestinian people will struggle and resist the occupier with all means possible, including armed struggle." If the President fails to speak and the Palestinians do declare an independent state, what security there is currently prevailing in Israel and the region could dissipate overnight.

This is a common sense resolution that clarifies United States policy toward Israel. We all hope that Israel and the Palestinian people can work out an arrangement that benefits both communities and the region as a whole. But we should never forget in the quest for peace that Israel is a proven friend and ally of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to expedite its consideration.

A TRIBUTE TO CYNTHIA S.
HARRINGTON

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, too often, our staff employees get little or no recognition for the work they do to keep this body functioning. They are the unsung heroes of this institution. Today, I would like to say a few words of thanks to one of those heroes.

A native of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and a graduate of Pennsylvania State University, Cynthia S. Harrington has worked for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives since 1973. Cindy began her tenure as Office Manager and Administrative Secretary to Congressman Ronald A. Sarasin of Connecticut, then moved to the office of Congressman Robert Davis of Michigan in 1979. She worked as Congressman Davis' Executive Assistant until 1993, when I had the fortune of hiring her as my Executive Assistant when I joined Congress.

For the last six years, Cindy has been one of the constants in my office—booking my flights, scheduling my meetings in Washington, paying the bills and generally making sure I was where I needed to be at any given point in time.

After 25 years of service to this institution and the American people, Cindy is leaving us and moving to the private sector. She will be working part-time for the CATO Travel Agency and will be spending more time being a mom to her 7-year-old daughter, Jessica, and spending more time at home with her husband, Lee, and Jessica. I expect she will continue to be active in her church and at her daughter's school as a classroom volunteer and on grounds projects, as well as with her daughter's Brownie troop selling cookies.

So, in closing, I just want to say, "Thank you, Cindy." Thank you for helping a newcomer in 1993 become an effective Congressman today. Thank you for helping me get home to my family every weekend. Thank you for making sure we all got paid. Thank you for serving the American people for a quarter-century.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

You will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY
GOVERNALE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anthony Governale, a former mayor of San Bruno, California and a dedicated community leader of San Mateo County who passed away on December 29, 1998.

Born in Brooklyn in 1929, Anthony Governale became interested in politics at a young age, helping his uncle run for a Brooklyn ward seat. He moved to San Francisco in 1950 where he met his wife who was performing in community theater—his other passion that was equal only to politics.

Mr. Governale was very active in politics, assisting numerous state, local and federal campaigns as well as serving as President of the San Mateo County Democratic Council. He was elected to public office in 1971 when he won election to the San Bruno City Council. He served as Mayor from 1974–75 and remained on the Council until 1978.

Mr. Governale was also active in a broad range of civic groups including serving as Executive Director of the Daly City-Colma Chamber of Commerce, board member of the San Mateo County Fair, and as President of the San Bruno Chamber of Commerce Governing Board up until his death.

Mr. Governale also served on the governing board of Shelter Network of San Mateo County and was the first Chairman of the San Mateo County Health Center Foundation Board. The Foundation's resources directly improve the lives of patients at San Mateo County General Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony Governale was a very kind and selfless man dedicated to his family, his community and his country. All who knew him sought his wisdom and advice on issues and life in general. He lives on through his three children and two grandchildren, through his devoted wife Helen, and through all of us who were blessed to be part of his life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to a wonderful man who lived a life of purpose and to extend our deepest sympathy to Helen Governale and the entire Governale family.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MILLS E.
GODWIN, JR.

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1999, Virginia buried a man in the loamy soil of Southeast Virginia. This was no ordinary man—his name was Mills E. Godwin, Jr. He

February 4, 1999

will be remembered as one of the greatest political figures of the 20th Century in Virginia.

Mills was born on November 19, 1914 in Chuckatuck, Virginia. Mills' lifelong interest in politics began at the age of 11. He later earned a bachelor's degree from William and Mary in 1934 and a law degree from the University of Virginia in 1938. While attending law school, Mills met Katherine Beale. They were married October 26, 1940. This beautiful marriage lasted for fifty-eight years until Mills passed away on January 30, 1999.

At the outbreak of World War II, he worked for the Federal Bureau of Investigation with distinction. He began his political career in 1947 by winning election to the Virginia House of Delegates. In 1951, Mills won election to the state Senate where he served for ten years until his election as Lieutenant Governor in 1961. In 1965, Mills became the Democratic nominee for Governor and was elected to the first of his two terms as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

During his first term of office, Mills created the community college system in Virginia while using state bonds to sponsor huge increases in funds for public education. Under Mills Godwin's leadership, policies were enacted improving educational opportunities for students from kindergarten to graduate school while improving teacher's pay.

Today, national leaders spend a lot of time touting their education programs. Yet, Mills was leading the way thirty years ago. Mills Godwin's vision for education in the 1960's still holds true as a model for the 1990's. Governor Godwin laid the cornerstone for today's educational system and our leaders should emulate his policies while remembering that a Virginian showed the way to improving education thirty years ago.

He left office because he was term-limited after one term but he would run again for Governor in 1973 as a Republican. He won the election and became the only two-term Governor of Virginia this century. During his second term, Mills established the Department of Corrections, reinstated the death penalty for violent offenders while increasing spending on our state's education and health systems and its sprawling infrastructure needs.

Mills is long remembered for revising the state Constitution and his lengthy term of service to the people of Virginia. However, I will remember him for his help to me when I was mayor of Richmond in the seventies and his leadership in and out of office. He unfailingly reached across party-lines to accomplish the greater good for all Virginians. After all, he remarked, there was "no higher honor" than to be Governor of Virginia.

In Virginia, we have many statesmen and Mills is one for the 20th Century. When it was the right thing to do, he acted with strong leadership because he was not permanently bound to a rigid devotion to history. He knew it was imperative we learn from our past mistakes—and this was his attitude for success.

He now joins his daughter Becky in heaven but he left a huge impact on our lives. May God Bless Mills, his wife Katherine, his sister, Leah Keith, and his family and friends.